

Application No. 10/578,312
Amendment dated December 5, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 8, 2007

10

Docket No.: 80640(302753)

REMARKS

Claims 18-36 are pending in this application, of which claims 22-23 have been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended and no new claims have been added.

The specification has been amended to correct various informalities, such as reference to claim numbers.

Claims 18, 20 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,178,549 to Neumann et al. (hereinafter "Neumann et al.").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Neumann et al. discloses a completely shielded metallic connector block for use in multiple circuit modules of an electronic device. Electrical communication between the circuit boards is effected by an array of metallic pins, which run through the blocks. The metal of the blocks can be held at ground or at a constant potential to increase the shielding between pins 38 as well as maintaining voltage and ground planes at constant levels throughout the modules. The blocks are insulated from the pins and circuit boards by a non-conductive coating. In the preferred embodiment, the metal of the blocks is aluminum and the coating is a hardcoat anodizing.

The Examiner has urged that element 69 shown in FIG. 6 is a ground contact and that element 65 shown in FIG. 13 is a signal contact.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Element 69 is an "inner contact point" and element 65 is a "contact element", as discussed in the specification. It is clear from FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 that pins 38 meet in block 28 and the ends 42 of pins 38 contact the inner contact points 69 and contact elements 65, which line holes in block 28. In contrast, in the present invention the signal conductive-contact 15a and the ground conductive-contact 16 extend out of holes in the circuit board.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/578,312
Amendment dated December 5, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 8, 2007

11

Docket No.: 80640(302753)

Claim 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Neumann et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,037,332 to Wilson (hereinafter "Wilson").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Wilson has been cited for teaching a conductive pipe 60 but, like Neumann et al. discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in claim 18, from which claim 19 depends.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Neumann et al. in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Neither Neumann et al. or APA teaches, mentions or suggest that features recited in claims 18 and 34, for which claims 21 and 36 respectively depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Neumann et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,785,534 to Longueville et al. (hereinafter "Longueville et al.").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Longueville et al. discloses an electrical connector has contacting devices which establish electrical contact with contacting devices of external terminals. The contacting devices have contact faces formed thereon. The contract faces having a shape which enables substantially overlap-free connections with contact faces on the contacting devices of the external terminals. This reduces boundary planes which lead to signal reflection.

Column 9, lines 62-66 disclose:

Adhering to the desired spacing from the impedance determining wall of the applicable channel can be achieved by means of a suitable embodiment of the

Application No. 10/578,312
Amendment dated December 5, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 8, 2007

12

Docket No.: 80640(302753)

course of the channel and/or a suitable embodiment and positioning of the guide lugs and/or retainers that fix the connecting devices in the channels.

This passage fails to disclose that intrinsic impedance of the signal conductive-contact is corrected by adjusting an outer diameter of the tubular shape and the dielectric constant of the dielectric material, as recited in claim 35 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 18-21 and 24-36, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: December 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By William L. Brooks
William L. Brooks

Registration No.: 34,129
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

1875 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 478-7370
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant